GENERAL ELECTION ISSUE.

DA
903
I8
v.4

UNION DEFENCE LEAGUE.

LIBRARY
JAN 22 1910
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

No. 1

IRISH FACTS

FOR

BRITISH PLATFORMS

Edited by IAN MALCOLM.

Vol. IV., No. I.—JANUARY, 1910.

CONTENTS.

	Page
CURRENT NOTES	3
HOME RULE RE-WRITTEN ON LIBERAL SLATE	10
Mr. JOHN REDMOND, M.P., on HOME RULE AND THE EMPIRE	16
A BRIEF AGAINST HOME RULE. Points for Speakers	19
IRISH DIARY	28

Published by
THE UNION DEFENCE LEAGUE,
25, Victoria Street, Westminster, S.W.

PRICE THREEPENCE.

IRISH FACTS.

JANUARY, 1910.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
CURRENT NOTES	3
HOME RULE RE-WRITTEN ON LIBERAL SLATE..	10
Mr. JOHN REDMOND, M.P., on HOME RULE AND THE EMPIRE ..	16
A BRIEF AGAINST HOME RULE. Points for Speakers	19
IRISH DIARY	28

Published by THE UNION DEFENCE LEAGUE,
25, Victoria Street, Westminster, S.W.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Asquith, Mr., M.P., Home Rule	3, 10
Extra Police, Cost of	8
Home Rule—	
Brief Against	19–28
Re-written on Liberal Slate	10–15
Irish Diary	28
Land Question	6, 7, 8
Liberal Unionists against Home Rule	3
Lords, House of, Barrier against Home Rule	5
McBride, Major, Speech...	5
Nationalists on Irish "Freedom"	12, 13, 14
Radicals who are not Home Rulers	3
Redmond, Mr. J., M.P.—	
Home Rule	11, 16–18
House of Lords	4
Russell, Mr. T. W., M.P., Nationalist attack on	8
United Irish League Rule	9

IRISH FACTS.

Vol. 4.—No. 1.] JANUARY, 1910.

CURRENT NOTES.

Home Rule Again.

Mr. Asquith's declaration at the Albert Hall in favour of Home Rule, and Mr. Redmond's acceptance of the pronouncement as satisfactory, has brought the question again to the front as an item in the Radical-Socialist election programme.

The whole matter is treated exhaustively in pages 10-15 of this number.

Liberal Unionists against Home Rule.

At the annual meeting of the Liberal Unionist Council held at Plymouth on December 3, Mr. Thomas Sinclair moved a resolution declaring against the grave constitutional menace of Home Rule, which the experience of the last thirty years had conclusively proved to be dangerous to Imperial unity and stability, and injurious to the best interests of Ireland. The Council considered that the true meaning of the separatist movement was never more clearly indicated than in the Irish-American manifesto just issued by Mr. John Redmond appealing for financial support in the coming election, on the ground "that no such opportunity has been offered Ireland to strike for liberty since Grattan moved the declaration of Independence."

Some Radicals who are not Home Rulers.

It should not be thought that Mr. Asquith's pronouncement has been received with complete favour.

The *Times* (December 8) reports that Mr. Fuller, M.P., a Radical Whip, addressed a meeting the previous night at Steeple Ashton, Wiltshire, in which village Mr. Walter Long is squire. Mr. Long was in the audience, and at the close of Mr. Fuller's speech asked him whether he was prepared to vote for Home Rule.

Mr. Fuller replied that he was not in favour of Home Rule as propounded by Mr. Redmond, but there was a great deal to be said in favour of the local self-government proposals of Mr. Birrell's Bill.

It is quite obvious that Mr. Fuller cannot well remain a member of a Government, one of whose chief planks is Home Rule.

Also the *Times* of December 21 reports that two of the Liberal candidates for Cornish constituencies have pronounced against Home Rule for Ireland.

Sir Clifford Cory, M.P., who is again contesting the St. Ives Division, in reply to a question at one of his meetings, said that his attitude towards Home Rule was unchanged. He would not vote for Home Rule or anything leading up to it.

Mr. A. E. Dunn, M.P., for the Camborne Division, has also been asked if he was in favour of Home Rule, and whether he would vote for or against it. Mr. Dunn said he would like to know what was meant. He was not in favour of a Prime Minister and a separate Cabinet for Ireland, and should vote against it; but if it meant that the Irish people should manage their purely local affairs in a purely local way, then he favoured it. We could not have separation with Ireland so near to us. It was impossible.

An Impossibility "Then."

Now that Mr. Redmond has agreed to assist Mr. Asquith in abolishing the House of Lords as an effective Second Chamber, a quotation Lord Dunraven has rescued from oblivion from one Mr. Redmond's speeches in 1894 is remarkably appropriate. The extract is published together with a letter from Lord Dunraven in the Irish papers of December 15. It is as follows —

> "It is only on a very partial view of the facts that such a course" (as support of an anti-House of Lords agitation) "could seem advisable to any practical politician or could be regarded by such a politician as other than absolutely abandoning one great movement, in the success of which Ireland has a vital interest, for one greater still, in the success of which Ireland, possibly, may be found in the end to have no interest at all."
>
> So said Mr. Redmond in 1894, and he continued—"It is positively amusing to read the facile prophecies of early destruction that are hurled at the House of Lords. One would imagine that it was one of the easiest things in the world to pull down altogether, or fundamentally modify, an institution which is almost as old as the English Monarchy itself, which has survived the vicissitudes of centuries, which occupies so large a place in English history, and which still, beyond all question, enjoys, deservedly or not, the confidence of millions of the English people. To think such a feat capable of accomplishment within, say, the lifetime of the present generation, is evidence of either childishness or imbecility. As well propose to abolish the Monarchy; and, indeed, it is doubtful whether, on the whole, England would not prefer the House of Lords to the Throne if it had to choose between the two. Two proposals have been made with regard to the House of Lords. One is to abolish the institution altogether; the other is to abolish its veto. How long does any man in his senses think it would take to carry the former proposal into effect?
>
> "Does anyone really believe that, without another revolution, the House of Lords could be abolished within the next fifty years? And does anyone really believe in the possibility of another Revolution within the same period directed against a fundamental part of a Constitution under which England has grown to be a first-class Power and English liberty has been irrevocably established? But it may be said that it would not be so gigantic or lengthened an operation to take away its veto. Perhaps not; but one thing is certain, that even this reform could not be effected without convulsing England from end to

end, without such a popular agitation as that country has not witnessed since the days of the Corn Laws, and without repeated and successful appeals to the country. In the meantime, it may be asked, what would have become of the Irish movement for Home Rule ? It would have been dead and buried long before the House of Lords' veto was abolished ; the population of Ireland would have been reduced by another million, a fresh cause for cutting down the Irish representation at Westminster being thereby furnished ; and thus the last state of that country would be worse than the first. It is possible to understand why British Liberals should imagine that it would be desirable to embark, without further ado, on an anti-House of Lords campaign ; it is impossible to conceive why any Irish Nationalist should do so."

Mr. Redmond has not yet explained what reasons lead him now to act contrary to his reasoned statement of 1894. His excuses are awaited with much interest.

The Professor speaks.

Mr. T. M. Kettle, M.P., speaking at Cookstown on November 28, said:—

" They were asked to place the House of Lords in the position of speaking as defenders of Ireland. **Had it not been for the House of Lords there would have been an Irish Parliament in Dublin sixteen years ago.** Would it have been a wise policy on the eve of a constitutional crisis to lend their strength to the assassins of Home Rule." —*The Irish News*, November 30.

Mr. Kettle has quite unconsicously given to Unionists one of the best arguments against the destruction of the Second Chamber. Clearly in 1893 the House of Lords correctly interpreted the will of the people: the result of the General Election of 1895 was proof positive. Injustice is therefore likely to be done if the power of the Second Chamber is destroyed, and measures will become the law of the land which are contrary to the wishes of the people.

An Amazing Speech.

Speaking at a celebration of the execution of Allen, Larkin, and O'Brien, at Kilkenny, on Sunday, November 28th, Major John McBride of Transvaal Irish Brigade said :—

". . . Fireside critics have written and spoken of the killing of Sergeant Brett as ' murder.' It was not murder. To my mind it was quite justifiable, as Ireland and England were practically at war, and the pity of it is that the gallant lads who effected the rescue of Colonel Kelly and Captain Deasy wasted good ammunition firing into the air, instead of into the heads of the howling English dogs who were snarling at their heels. If Nihilists in Russia kill a Grand Duke it is gloated over in the English Press as the removal of a petty tyrant and as a blow struck in the cause of human freedom. But **if an Irishman in broad daylight at home kills one of the foreigners that garrison this country for England, it is called ' murder.'**

". . . Our history should have shown us long ago that our English masters are a bad people to run away from, while there are none so cowardly if you face them squarely like men. . .

". . . To-day we have a race of Irishmen who have been taught to look to the British Parliament for a removal of their ills. What is worse still, the last generation has produced the cynic and the sneerer, who discourages and jeers at every manly aspiration of those of his fellow countrymen who still cherish the traditions of their fathers, and who will never bow the knee to the stranger. We have the so-called national representatives of Ireland driving it into the ears of the world that all we aspire to is the position of an Australian or a Canadian Colony. To such an extent has our country been cajoled and misrepresented that really the time has come when **Irishmen must make it known with no uncertain voice whether they are opposed to British rule, root and branch in this country, or not prepared to bury the hatchet, bury their aspirations, and sleep for ever in the foul bed that is being made for them by the conciliating statesmen England. . .**

". . . The voice of young India is beginning to make itself heard and felt. Not much longer can that fair and fertile land be used as a dumping ground for ignorant, insolent, and domineering English officials. From this meeting Young Ireland sends a message of hope and greeting to that country and will never rest satisfied until India is a self-governing nation. . .

". . . **I appeal to you most earnestly to do all in your power to prevent your countrymen from entering the degraded British army.** If you prevent 500 men from enlisting you do nearly as good work if not quite as exciting, as if you shot 500 men on the field of battle. and, also, you are making the path smooth for the approaching conquest of England by Germany. Let one of your mottoes then be 'no recruits for England'; no recruits for the country that has held you in bondage for nigh 800 years, no recruits for the cowardly nation, whose sons have never been able to win a battle by themselves. . . .

". . . They (the Irish Brigade) maintained the honour of their native land on many a hard fought field. Their chief regret was that the fight did not take place on Irish soil, and for Ireland's cause; **with God's help and our own determination we trust to see that day, before the great Creator of us all calls on us to render an account of our transgressions in this world. . . .**

". . . The young men of Ireland must register a solemn vow that come weal, or come woe, they will never allow English rule to run smoothly in their Ireland home."—*Kilkenny People*, December 4.

Mr Dillon's comment upon this speech will be found on page 12.

Good Act.

Unionists would do well to keep the following extracts from a speech by Mr. Dillon, M.P., at Dungarvan, on December 12. He said of the Irish Land Act—

"The Bill as it now stands, though only a remnant of the Bill as it originally stood, is an exceedingly valuable Bill, and I ask the people of Ireland by organization, and agitation, to extract all the benefits that are in it.

"This Bill is a great Bill for the West of Ireland, and will do a vast amount of good for the congested populations of the West,

who are, after all, the main remnant of the Celtic race in Ireland." —*Freeman*, December 13.

When Irish Home Rulers are declaiming against the House of Lords for "mutilating" the Irish Land Bill, they may be usefully reminded of Mr. Dillon's words.

Poor Mr. Birrell.

After Mr. Dillon, Mr. Sheehy, M.P. He adopts quite a different tone, and at Kill, on November 28, said:——

"I regret to say that we have a right to complain of the want of firmness on the part of Mr. Birrell in yielding submission to the Lords' amendments. It surprised me to see Mr. Birrell in the House yielding up what I consider, and what I know he considered, an essential part of his Bill, to give way to the House of Lords, and the Irish landlords through their representatives in the House of Lords over that great question. . . . Now it is for the people to employ compulsion themselves as compulsion would not be legalised through the interference of the House of Lords. . . . Next to the House of Lords, on Mr. Birrell's head the blame would rest for anything that might occur in Ireland for the next couple of years."—*Drogheda Independent*, December 4.

Mr. Birrell must find the way of the conciliator hard. After giving way to Irish Nationalists upon almost every conceivable opportunity, he is treated with this ingratitude.

Mr. Ginnell's Way.

Mr. Ginnell, M.P., who claims to have been the originator of cattle-driving, has a new way with the landlords which for the present lacks the sanction of his chief. Speaking at Rathowen on November 28, he said:—

"If the landlords would not sell to their rack-rented tenants at a fair price, the plan of the tenants for the present was to pay no more rent, but to lodge it in the hands of private trustees, less the reductions which purchase at a fair price would have given them. Ask the landlord to sell at that price, and if he refused, use for fighting purposes the money lodged. The advice given by some to lodge the money in bank was a trick of the enemy, because it would allow the landlords to get every penny, and would leave the tenants without money to fight it out with them. The money must be lodged with a private trustee, in order to bind the tenants together inseparably, and make it impossible for one of them to pay behind the back of his fellows. No tenant should know who the trustee was or anything about the plans until he had put down his money, and was in the same boat with the rest. . . .

"Supposing they were determined to get a particular ranch broken up, they should, for secrecy and success, appoint a most skilful man to direct proceedings. Put a few young men with bicycles under his control, and then they should themselves agree to act instantly on a given signal. On the signal being given the cattle would be cleared off all the ranches for miles around in a single night, and on the following morning while the police were searching

for the cattle, they could hold a ploughing match—twenty or thirty ploughs could enter on the ranch that they wanted and break it up. With four or five hours start of the police, that number of ploughs would have the best part of the land spoiled for grass.

"With broad belts turned over through it here and there, an end would be put to ranching there at all events."—*Irish Times*, November 29.

No Mayo Men in Roscommon.

From the *Roscommon Messenger* (December 4):—

"In discussing the Land Bill at a meeting of the Tulsk branch of the United Irish League on November 28, it was seen that the measure was of no practical use to Roscommon, as there are very few tenants under the £7 valuation limit, so it behoves all Roscommon men to band together and force the hand of the Board, and compel that unjust body to give the land of Roscommon to Roscommon men alone until all are supplied. The meeting were determined to oppose the flooding of the place with migrants, and the following resolution was adopted:—Proposed by Mr. Kelly, D.C., and seconded by Mr. Shanagher, Co.C.—"That we hereby protest against the action of the C.D. Board in bringing migrants from Mayo to Roscommon, as all the available land in the county is required for residents of the county, and that until every native is supplied we are determined to oppose the importation of any planters into Roscommon by every means in our power, and we will not stop even at physical resistance, should it be necessary in order to enforce our rights."

Cost of Birrellism.

At the quarterly meeting of the Roscommon County Council held on December 3—Mr. John Fitzgibbon in the chair—a letter was read from the Deputy Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary, enclosing a certificate of the sum of £1,297 2s. 10d. chargeable for extra police on the county for the half year ended March 31, 1909. That is the cost of Birrellism in Roscommon.

A Government "Grabber."

It was somewhat audacious of Mr. T. W. Russell to boast of the "democratic" nature of his Department, as he did at Dublin, on December 16, at a time when Galway Nationalists were protesting against his Department "grabbing" Aughrane Castle and demesne.

It is the old, old story. The people of the district wanted the land but the Estates Commissioners sold it to the Department of Agriculture for a school of forestry. Hence an indignation meeting and the attendance of three Nationalist Members of Parliament.

Mr. T. W. Russell's department was duly denounced by the speakers just as if it were a Tory landlord. This estimable Home Ruler is fond of attacking the landlords, and attributing to them all kinds of evil ways. The demonstration should convince him that it is not necessary to possess all the disqualifications he is fond of attributing to political opponents to incur the anger of the people.

A Light on League Rule.

From the *Roscommon Herald* (December 4) :—

" At a meeting of the North Galway branch of the United Irish League, Mr. Roche, M.P , proposed a resolution calling on Mr. Beirne to give up the lands and not compel the executive to adopt extreme measures.

" There are four constables and an acting sergeant at present located on the property. As it was impossible to get local carriers to bring out provisions to the farms, the constabulary authorities have procured a special van and transport car and driver."

U.I. League Threat.

From the *Roscommon Herald* (December 11) :—

" Aughavas Branch (Co. Leitrim)—Messrs. John Abbot, J.P., and Robert Navan were asked to attend the meeting and explain why they still continue to hold communication with the notorious McNeill's. As expected neither appeared, and they were unanimously condemned, and anyone in future having any dealings with those two fellows may expect to hear from this branch."

HOME RULE RE-WRITTEN ON LIBERAL SLATE.

The Plot Against the Constitution.

"None of us will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which keeps Ireland bound to England."—Mr. Parnell, Cincinnati, February 23, 1880.

At the Albert Hall on December 10, the Prime Minister outlined the Radical programme at the General Election. In his speech he spread wide the net to catch every single section that imagines that the House of Lords stands in the way of the realization of its own particular aim. Only help us, he declared in effect, to destroy the present Constitution and reduce the second Chamber to impotence and nothing remains to prevent you getting all you want. He proceeded to declare the adherence of his Party to to the various "reforms" urged by the various bodies to whom he appealed. Thus was the alliance against the Constitution consummated. Out for votes and support, Mr. Asquith did not overlook the Irish Nationalists.

Mr. Asquith's Declaration.—

Upon the question of Home Rule he said:—

> "The solution of the problem can be found only in one way—by a policy which, while explicitly safeguarding the supreme and indefeasible authority of the Imperial Parliament, will set up in Ireland a system of full self-government in regard to purely Irish affairs. There is not, and there cannot be, any question of rival or competing supremacies but subject to these conditions, that is the Liberal policy. For reasons which I believe to have been adequate, the present Parliament was disabled in advance from proposing any such solution; but in the new House of Commons the hands of a Liberal Government and of a Liberal majority will in this matter be entirely free."—Authorised Edition, p. 7.

It will be noticed that there is about this declaration a vagueness as to the time of the introduction of the Bill for the disintegration of the United Kingdom. Even the *Freeman's Journal* has to admit that "it does not specifically state the time and the order in which the policy will be applied." (December 15). Since Mr. Asquith at the same time made declarations of a similar character in respect of licensing, disestablishment, education, and other questions, there is likely to be a very pretty quarrel among the conspirators when, if ever, the time comes to make payment for their support in the Prime Minister's attack on the constitution.

That however is none of our affair. All Unionists are concerned with is to know in what way in Mr. Asquith's declaration was interpreted by Mr. Redmond and the Irish Nationalists. If it was satisfactory to them, then Unionists would be fully justified in treating it as tantamount to a declaration in favour of a Home Rule Bill being introduced in the next Parliament if by any misfortune the Prime Minister should again be returned to power.

Mr. Redmond's Acceptance.

Sufficient to say that a meeting in Dublin on December 15, Mr. J. Redmond said :—

> " I appeal to the people of Ireland to-day to say whether time has not vindicated our policy and our programme. Mr. Asquith's statement on Home Rule has been read. What does it amount to ? Firstly, it means the absolute discrediting and throwing on one side the policy of Devolution and the coming back of the whole Liberal Party—those who were regarded as Roseberyites as well as the others—the coming back of the whole Liberal Party to the standard of Gladstone's Home Rule. Mr. Asquith's definition of Home Rule in that statement is a vivid and accurate statement of Gladstone's Home Rule. He puts that as the policy of his party, as the policy of his colleagues of the Cabinet, and in the second place he asks from the British electorate a mandate to enable his party and himself to deal with that subject in the next Parliament by legislation—by legislation the moment he has abolished the House of Lord's veto. Now I say to you, ladies and gentlemen, that that is the greatest chance that Ireland has ever had in our lifetime of achieving Home Rule—abolition of the Lord's veto and the promise of the Liberal Party to proceed with Home Rule as soon as that veto is removed."—*Freeman's Journal*, December 16.

The day before (December 14) at a special meeting of the National Directory, the following resolution was passed :—

> " That we have read with great satisfaction the statement made by the Prime Minister on Friday last, that full self-government for Ireland in all Irish affairs is the policy of the Liberal Party, and that the Liberal Party claims a mandate from the electorate to deal with the Irish question on those lines as soon as the veto of the Lords is cleared out of the road."

Every Unionist has therefore the right to declare that Home Rule is to be an issue at the General Election : and every elector knows that a vote for the Triple Alliance—Radical-Socialist-Irish-Nationalist combination—is a vote not only for the destruction of the Constitution by the elimination of an effective Second Chamber, but also for its further destruction by disintegrating the unity of the United Kingdom.

Words, Idle Words.

Of course Radicals in replying to Unionist arguments will assert the importance of the Prime Minister's qualifying words—" while explicitly safeguarding the supreme and indefeasible authority of the Imperial Parliament." When the phrase is examined it will be found to be meaningless. Words always bring much satisfaction to Radicals, but when their worthlessness is found there will be no satisfaction to the elector. In the first place the very fact that it is Home Rule is sufficient to show that " the supreme and indefeasible authority of the Imperial Parliament " will be weakened. Powers now possessed by the Imperial Parliament will be taken away or minimized. How then can a claim be made that they will be unimpaired ?

Besides there has also to be considered the manner of men to whom are to be entrusted these new powers under Home Rule. Are they men who are in any way likely to have the slightest regard for "the supreme and indefeasible authority of the Imperial Parliament." On the contrary they are known not to care a brass farthing for its authority.

Some Home Rule Speeches.

There are plenty of extracts from Mr. Redmond's past speeches to show that he has no intention whatever of acting under the authority of the Imperial Parliament. They will be found in another article. But for the moment it is interesting to record the utterances of Home Rule men at the very time when the Prime Minister surrenders to the Home Rulers with the reservation as to "safeguarding the supreme and indefeasible authority of the Imperial Parliament." Do they recognise this part of the bargain ?

That is the question, and its importance cannot be too much insisted upon. It can be said without fear of contradiction that the Irish Home Rulers do not.

Take Mr. Redmond ! He at Dublin on December 15, said :—

> "We have before us to-day the best chance which Ireland has ever had for the last century, of tearing up and trampling under foot that infamous Act of Union."—*Freeman's Journal*, December 16.

Are those words of a man who is likely to have regard for the authority of the Imperial Parliament ?

Again take the following extracts from recent speeches of Irish Home Rulers—

Mr. J. Devlin, M.P., at Claremorris on Sunday, November 28, said :—

> "Till British rule was driven out there could be no prosperity possible in their country "—*Freeman's Journal*, November 29.

Mr. J. Dillon, M.P., at the meeting of the Town Tenants' League, December 9, at the Dublin Mansion House, referred to the McBride oration* and said :—

> "His (McBride's) advice was that we should urge upon the German people to hurry up their invasion of England and to call on Ireland on their way to England and drop a hundred thousand rifles and adequate ammunition for our youths. Well, the only criticism I have to make upon that policy is this : that if I believed that that was a practicable policy and the policy for Ireland, I would not make it the matter of a public oration."—*Freeman's Journal*, December 10.

Mr. Mooney, M.P., at Newry on December 9, said :—

> "His country ought to be in possession of its own independence, self-governed, self-controlled."—*Freeman's Journal*, December 10.

Mr. Stephen Gwynn, M.P., at Collon, on December 12, said :—

> "The case for Home Rule really rested on this, that Irishmen would never be content until they had the freedom to govern themselves which was given to all the nations of the world."—*Freeman's Journal*, December 13.

See page 5.

"Right to Freedom."

So Captain Condon, the associate of the "Manchester Martyrs," on a recent trip to Ireland under the auspices of Mr. Redmond and the Irish Parliamentary Party, said at Cork :—

> "Ireland had an inalienable right to freedom. They had not abandoned, and would never abandon, the recognition of Ireland's right to freedom."—*Freeman's Journal*, October 11.

Perhaps Mr. Devlin, M.P., at Cork, put the position as neatly as possible. He said :—

> "Captain Condon has not changed in his hopes, in his passions, and in his aspirations for Ireland **no more than they had changed.** They all believed that **Ireland's destiny was to be a free land under a free sky, but they were all agreed—the revolutionist of the past and the constitutionalist of to-day—that it was the function of practical and sane Irish patriots to utilise whatever instrument God and progress had given them to forge their way to Irish freedom.**"—*Freeman's Journal*, September 6.

To this may usefully be added the following extract from Mr. Redmond's speech at Watertord :—

> "The generation with which Captain O'Meagher Condon had worked had almost entirely passed away, but the presence of the young men of Waterford there that night meant that they upheld the same principles as the men who had associated with Captain O'Meagher Condon in working for the freedom of Ireland. It showed that every man in the crowd knew the history of the Manchester rescue, and treasured in his heart of hearts the real meaning of the prayer in the dock, 'God Save Ireland.' "—*Freeman's Journal*, September 9.

The question naturally arises, what was the real "meaning"—"the same principles" to which Mr. Redmond referred. An address presented by the Ancient Order of Hibernians is more explicit. It says :—

> "Thanks to the movement inaugurated by Davitt, Parnell, and Biggar, and carried forward on the same lines and for the same ideals to-day by Redmond, Dillon, Devlin, and their colleagues, **Ireland is marching steadfastly towards the goal of her freedom.** It is with gratitude and a glorious pride that we notice the loyal support that has been given to the National Movement by our kinsmen in America. The reception tendered to you last night on your arrival was the expression of Ireland's gratitude for past services, as well as an indication of the buoyant hopes we entertain for the speedy realisation of the patriot's dream. In you, O'Meagher Condon, we recognise one of those connecting links with the past, which all nations cherish, and you are ready to-day with voice and pen to give your unflagging support to Ireland's leaders with as much enthusiasm as you grasped the sword to lead Ireland in the dark but historic '67. We are sure it will interest you to know that **the ranks of Hibernians to-day are composed of the men and children of those who swore allegiance to the Irish Republic with you.**"—*Freeman's Journal*, September 6.

Who reading any of the above extracts can find the slightest reference to the regard which is to be had to the "supreme and indefeasible authority of the Imperial Parliament"? It is never mentioned, but on the contrary there is always a distinct indication that Irish Home Rule means Irish independence.

Independence Claimed.

Further confirmation comes from the reports of Mr. T. P. O'Connor's begging mission to the United States. The importance of Irish Home Rulers declarations there lies in the fact that they rely in a very large part upon the United States for dollars to carry on the campaign here. "We welcome, therefore," says Mr. Redmond in a letter to Mr. T. P. O'Connor, which is published in the *Freeman's Journal* for December 12, "the ever generous help of our friends in America, and we trust it will not fail us until victory has been won."

And what is that victory for the consummation of which the Irishmen of the United States are besought to contribute dollars. Mr. T. P. O'Connor explained it at Haverhill in Massachusetts. He is reported by the *Irish World* (December 4) to have said:—

> "I can't tell you to a year or to a day when it will be, but I can tell you that after the next election, no matter which party is in power, the Irish Party will hold the balance. Our language to either party, Tory or Liberalist, will be—"Give Ireland liberty or get out, and if you don't get out we'll kick you out."

Pretty language surely from the partners in a bargain the terms of which are said to contain a clause which preserves the "supreme and indefeasible authority of the Imperial Parliament."

And again in the same speech, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, M.P., said:—

> "Give to us as you gave to Parnell and I'll promise you that within a few years, and a very few at that, the land of Ireland will belong to Ireland, her universities will be her own and HER LIBERTY WILL BE WON SO THAT HER EMBLEM WILL TAKE ITS PLACE ALONG WITH THE OTHER FLAGS OF THE WORLD'S NATIONS."

What about the authority ot the Imperial Parliament now? Where is it?

At Toledo Mr. T. P. O'Connor appealed for dollars. The Toledo meeting passed a resolution. These are the terms as set out in the *Irish World* (December 4):—

> "That the policy as advocated by Hon. (!) John E. Redmond and approved by the people living on the soil of Ireland, is the policy that shall have our hearty support and co-operation; that this support and co-operation will be given until the Irish Parliamentary Party will have won the NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE INDEPENDENCE OF IRELAND."

Not a word, it will be seen, is said of safeguarding the authority of the Imperial Parliament. On the contrary, the dollars are obtained on the

distinct understanding that the Imperial Parliament is to be ended altogether and that Ireland is to secure her "National legislature and administrative independence."

A Question for Mr. Asquith.

What then is the question upon which definite information is wanted from the Prime Minister? It is this:—"Has he Mr. Redmond's authority to declare that the Irish Home Rulers are prepared to accept terms which will 'explicitly safeguard the supreme and indefeasible authority of the Imperial Parliament'"?

A plain "Yes" or "No" is required. Obviously somebody in either case is being badly sold. If the reply is "Yes," Mr. Redmond will have to satisfy the American subscribers where money has been obtained as the result of wholly different opinions. If the reply is "No" then the Prime Minister is endeavouring to calm the apprehensions of the electors by statements which he knows one party to the transaction has not the slightest intention of putting into practice. It remains for some enterprising heckler to clear up the mystery.

PHILIP G. CAMBRAY.

MR. JOHN REDMOND, M.P., ON HOME RULE AND THE EMPIRE.

In view of Mr. Asquith's declaration at the Albert Hall in favour of handing over the Government of Ireland to Mr. Redmond and the United Irish League, and the Ancient Order of Hibernians, we make no apology for recalling to our readers the following authoritative utterances by the Home Rule Leader.

Independence.

Parnellite Convention in Dublin, October 7, 1895.

"The Nationalists of Ireland will never lay down their arms until they have achieved the independence of their country. . . . **The cant about the union of hearts must be given up;** the absolute nonsense about the love of the English democracy for Ireland must be done away with; . . . if we want Home Rule, we must make it inconvenient to England to refuse it."—*Daily Independent*, October 8, 1895.

A "Bag and Baggage" Policy.

At Kanturk, November 17, 1895.

"Ireland for the Irish is our motto, and the consummation of all our hopes and aspirations is, in one word, **to drive English rule, sooner or later, bag and baggage from our country.**"—*Daily Independent*, December 9, 1895.

At Newry, June 16, 1897.

"I remember when Parnell was asked whether he would, on behalf of the United Nationalist nation that he represented, accept as a final settlement the Home Rule compromise proposed by Gladstone. I remember his answer. He said: 'I believe in the policy of taking from England anything we can wring from her which will strengthen our arms to go on for more. **I will accept the Home Rule compromise of Gladstone as an instalment of our rights,** but I refuse to say that it is a final settlement of the National question, and I declare that no man shall set a boundary on the onward march of the nation.' That is our motto."—*Independent*, June 17, 1897.

Undying Hatred.

At Wexford, November 1, 1898.

"The first and greatest of the duties of an Irishman is **to cherish undying hatred** to foreign rule in this country. . . . To be prepared by every and any means open to brave and honourable men to advance the cause of Irish freedom."

At Maryborough, October 20, 1901.

"My one principle in public life is—in every department of the Government, from the highest to the lowest; from the Chief Secretary in his backroom in Dublin Castle to the land grabber and the bailiff in the country town—to make every department of Government in this country difficult and dangerous."—*Freeman's Journal*, October 21, 1901.

The Brave Boers.

Interviewed in the *Boston Globe*, as reported in that paper November 1, 1901.

"Who will undertake to say that the separation of Ireland from England is impossible ? Things which have appeared much more impossible have often taken place, and it did not seem more impossible a few years ago that England would be humbled to the dust as she now is by a handful of farmers in South Africa."

At Cork, July 18, 1902.

"You have got every man of you in his sphere to do something, great or small, to make the Government of Ireland by England under the present system, as I have said, **difficult, dangerous, and impossible.**" —*Freeman's Journal*, June, 24, 1907.

Armed Revolt.

At House of Commons, April 12, 1905.

"If he believed that there was the smallest reasonable chance of success, he would have no hesitation in advising his fellow countrymen to endeavour to end the present system by **armed revolt.**"—*Times*, April 13, 1905

At New Ross, June 23, 1907.

"We tell her (Great Britain) frankly that the choice of weapons with which we work will be a mere question of expediency with us, because we believe that we are entitled in this movement to use every weapon which is open to a God-fearing race such as the Irish.

"We tell her that **we to-day hate her rule** just as bitterly as our forefathers did.

"We tell her that we are as much **rebels to her rule** to-day as our forefathers were in '98."—*Freeman's Journal*, June 24, 1907.

Success to the Extremists.

In Dublin, September 1, 1908, Mr. Redmond expressed the desire for the success of the Separatists and Physical Force Party in America and elsewhere. Said Mr. Remond :—

"If there are men who are more extreme than we are, my prayer for them is **success to all their ideals and all their hopes.**"—*Freeman's Journal*, September 2, 1908.

There **are** men who are "more extreme" than Mr. Redmond at any rate professes to be. "Their ideals" and their "hopes" which Mr. Redmond desires to be successful have been recently disclosed in the *Chicago Citizen*, of July 11, 1908 :—

"There is not an Irishman in America to-day in whose veins good red blood is flowing, **who would not rejoice to hear that a German army was marching in triumph across England from Yarmouth to Milford Haven.".**

Does Mr. Redmond pray for a successful invasion of England ?

God Save President Redmond.

Met at Quarantine by a reporter for the New York Herald, Mr. Redmond said :—

> "What Ireland wants is Home Rule and a Government of its own, and that is what Ireland is going to have. I hope to see Ireland placed in the scale of nations **much after the fashion of the United States as to constitution**, but it will, of course, be some time before there is actual independence there."—*Irish Independent*, September 26, 1908.

Mr. Redmond's ideal is Ireland an independent Republic ; and Mr. Winston Churchill would have us believe that "if you want to make the British Empire strong, Ireland should be given Home Rule !"—Swansea, August 15, 1908.

Mr. Redmond's Guest.

Mr. Redmond, speaking in New York on October 7, 1908, said :—

> ". . . I now give an invitation to visit Ireland. I see in front of me Patrick Ford, a man who for half a century, by his manhood and his great newspaper, the *Irish World*, has given Ireland unstinted support, and sitting back of me here is O'Meagher Condon, who in the day of stress and trial fearlessly gave Ireland her national anthem, 'God save Ireland.' I invite them and others like them (if their like can be found) to visit us and see for themselves what we have been doing, and receive their thanks from the warm hearts of our people."—*Irish World*, October 17, 1908.

Mr. Patrick Ford is the gentlemen referred to in the Report of the Special Commission as **"a known advocate of crime and the use of dynamite."** His views are admirably expressed in an article which appeared over his signature in the *Irish World* in November, 1899, and which was an appeal for funds to help the United Irish League. Mr. Redmond's guest wrote :—

> **"If any set of Irishmen see their way to successfully attack England by physical force, why, let them go ahead, and God bless them. If there is any dynamite or lyddite that will blow the British Empire up into the clouds or down into the bottomless pit, why, let it be used and forthwith. We believe in all that sort of thing, and we feel sure that the men at the head of the United Irish League are not contrary-minded."**

The man at the head of the United Irish League is Mr. J. Redmond. Mr. Redmond, in England, will probably plead for Home Rule in words of moderation and sympathy, but can the leopard change his spots ? No ! Neither can Mr. Redmond change his views to suit a British audience. In black and white he has placed on record **his hatred of Great Britain and his desire to injure her people.**

[*The above may be had in leaflet form from the Secretary of the Union Defence League, 25, Victoria Street, Westminster, S.W., Price, 1s. per 100 ; 5s. per 1000.*]

A BRIEF AGAINST HOME RULE.

POINTS FOR SPEAKERS.

The case against Home Rule would require a volume adequately to deal with it. Speakers who want to go into the question, especially in its constitutional aspect cannot do better than read Prof. Dicey's books—"England's case against Home Rule" (1886) and "A Leap in the Dark, or our new Constitution" (1893).

In the following pages an attempt is made to reply to some of the assertions of Irish Home Rulers. Their contention has been most concisely expressed in the resolution moved in the House of Commons on March 30, 1908, by Mr. John Redmond, M.P., the Irish Home Rule Leader.
The resolution was as follows:—

> "That the present system of Government in Ireland is in opposition to the will of the Irish people and gives them no voice in the management of their own affairs; that the system is consequently inefficient and extravagantly costly; that it does not enjoy the confidence of any section of the population; that it is productive of universal discontent and unrest, and is incapable of satisfactorily promoting the material and intellectual progress of the people; that the reform of Irish Government is a matter vital to the interests of Ireland and calculated greatly to promote the well-being of the people of Great Britain; and, in the opinion of this House, the solution of this problem can only be attained by giving to the Irish people the legislative and executive control of all purely Irish affairs."

In the following pages the assertions in the resolution have been taken *seriatim* and suggestions made of the points which could be used to contradict them and show their inaccuracy.

(1) That the present system of Government in Ireland is in opposition to the will of the Irish people.

Mr. Redmond means "that the present system of Government is in opposition to the will of the United Irish League"—a very different matter.

The United Irish League is now the Irish Nationalist organisation. But it is the fact, that, whatever its numerical majority may be, its membership is in point of intellect, wealth, and capacity grieviously lacking. Striking confirmation of this is given by Mr. A. J. Kettle, one of the Treasurers of the United Irish League, and therefore in a position to speak with authority on the subject. Writing to the *Freeman's Journal* (July 18, 1907), Mr. Kettle says:—

> "Let us just quietly examine the composition of the United Irish League. On its roll of membership there are no landlords or ex-landlords, few merchants, fewer Irish manufacturers. There are few of the men who are managing the business of Ireland in city or town connected with the League. The bankers who regulate our finances,

the railway or transit men who control our trade, internal and external, even the leading cattle men who handle most of our animal produce, are not to be found in its ranks."

So at the South King's County Executive, Mr. Meehan, M.P., said :—

"Unfortunately their organisation was backward, not alone in King's County, but in many other parts of Ireland." Alluding to the apathy on the part of the people of Birr in connection with the national organisation, the speaker said :—"That he would be the last in the world to find fault, but he said that it was the business men who had failed to give the organisation their support."—*Irish Times*, October 12, 1909.

These are important admissions of the unrepresentative character of the League, and coming, as they do, from Irish Home Rule sources, who shall question their accuracy?

On the other hand, the classes opposed to Home Rule include :—

The Capitalists.
The Manufacturers.
The Merchants.
The Professional Men.
All with anything to lose.

Protestants, with few exceptions, are against Home Rule. Protests were received against the Home Rule Bill of 1893 from—

(1) The Church of Ireland,
(2) The Presbyterians,
(3) The Methodist Church,
(4) The Quakers,

and also from an influential body of Catholic Loyalists. There is no reason to believe these bodies are less opposed to Home Rule to-day than they were then.

There is in Ireland a minority, over 1,000,000 out of a population of 4,500,000. They are scattered all over the South and West; but in the North, in Ulster, they are by far the larger part of the population.

They are loyal to the core to the Crown, the Empire, and the Union.

They are the most prosperous and the most industrious people in Ireland.

And they detest Home Rule.

(2) That the present system of Government in Ireland gives them no voice in the management of their own affairs.

On the contrary, the Irish people have just the same voice in the management of their own local affairs as inhabitants of Great Britain. They have the same system of local government, comprising county councils, town councils, urban district councils, rural district councils, and boards of guardians. As Mr. Redmond himself said at Ballybofey (August 29, 1907), "the elected representatives of the people have absolute control over the levying and spending of the rates of the county." (Speeches, page 1.)

At Westminster they have more voice in the management of their own (and other persons') affairs than they are justly entitled to.

Ireland has 101 members, with a population of 4,458,775, or **one member for every 44,147 persons.**

England has 460 members, with a population of 30,808,539, or **one member for every 66,975 persons.**

Wales has 30 members, with a population of 1,719,304, or **one member for every 57,310 persons.**

Scotland has 70 members, with a population of 4,472,103, or **one member for every 63,885 persons.**

At the proportion of one member to represent 62,721 people, a figure arrived at by dividing the population of the United Kingdom by the number of Members of Parliament—

Great Britain should have **590** members instead of 560.

Ireland should have **71** members instead of 101.

(3) That the present system of Government in Ireland is inefficient and extravagantly costly.

If the **local** government system is "inefficient and extravagantly costly," the fault must be with the local councils, and no scheme of Home Rule would have the slightest effect of remedying the fault.

As regards the **central** government, to say that it is "inefficient" is probably true enough of the Departments of Law and Police during the Radical Government. No one, having regard to prisoners convicted of cattle-driving and agrarian crimes, could accuse Mr. Cherry's department of "efficiency." With regard to the Police Department, the blight of Mr. Birrell's policy is enough to give any department cause for complaints.

But of the Irish departments generally the case is different.

Mr. Redmond must first convert Mr. Birrell. Whatever opinions Mr. Birrell may hold regarding Home Rule from the point of view of the responsibility of the Chief Secretary, and his relations with the Irish departments, he will have nothing to say against the working of the departments themselves. Speaking in the House of Commons on February 13, 1907, Mr. Birrell said:—

> "I find these great departments of State, or whatever you like to call them, admirably manned. I have not a word to say, I need scarcely add, against the distinguished officials at their head. They are all remarkable men; their abilities no doubt vary—such is the habit of mankind. Of their devotion to the public service I have no doubt, nor have I any doubt whatever of the mass of information that they acquire. I do not doubt their experience, I do not doubt that they have gained, and must necessarily have gained, great knowledge of Ireland."—Parl. Deb., February 13, cols. 198, 199.

Mr. Redmond also adds "and extravagantly costly."

At Drumkeerin, on October 27, 1907, Mr. Redmond said that the Government of Ireland "was modelled on lines of extravagance unknown in any similarly situated country in the world," and "that if they had a Government of their own they could run the country on one-half the present expenditure."—*Freeman's Journal*, October 28, 1907.

It is well to test this statement by certain facts in connection with the Irish Council Bill. That Bill proposed to give to the Irish "a Government of their own" over the most important departments of Irish administration. It should follow then, from Mr. Redmond's speech, that the expenditure on those departments ought to be reduced one-half. Did Mr. Birrell propose to do that? On the contrary, he called upon the taxpayers to contribute an **additional £650,000** a year to the cost of running these departments.

In endeavouring to justify this additional burden, Mr. Birrell said (House of Commons, May 7, 1907):—

> "The present cost of administering the services covered by these eight departments is a little over two millions. **Now, there is no single man, however stern and strong and Parnellian he may be and certainly no body of men, unless they were wholly bereft of their senses, who would consent to take over these eight departments at that figure.** To do so would be to plunge into a sea of troubles, and without the faintest prospect of doing any real good work either for Ireland or for one's own reputation."—Parl. Deb., May 7, col. 94.

From this it is evident that, so far from Ireland being extravagntly governed, a step towards giving Ireland a Government of its own involves very heavy additional expenditure.

Mr. Birrell's is not the only evidence to this effect. Strange to say, the most complete contradiction to Mr. Redmond comes from Mr. Redmond himself! Speaking in the House of Commons on the same day—shortly after Mr. Birrell's speech from which the above extract has been taken—Mr. Redmond said:—

> "I am myself strongly of opinion that the amount mentioned of £650,000 a year is **altogether inadequate.**"—Parl. Deb., May 7, col. 125.

Mr. Redmond must make up his mind one way or the other.

(4) That it does not enjoy the confidence of any section of the population.

As has already been shown in Section 1, the present system of Irish Government does enjoy the confidence of a large section of the population—that the section of the population consisting of all that is best of the Irish people.

And it ought also to be remembered that the present system of Government in Ireland **does enjoy the confidence** of the majority of the inhabitants of Great Britain—and they, as the "predominant partners" (see section 7) are very largely interested in the system of Government in Ireland. It is a fact that, from 1886 onward, at no General Election have the electors of Great Britain given a majority vote for Home Rule.*

(5) That it is productive of universal discontent and unrest.

It is **not** the present system of Government in Ireland that "is productive of universal discontent and unrest." What does produce the effect mentioned are the speeches and actions of Irish Nationalist M.P.'s and agitators.

* In 1906 the Liberals obtained a majority in Great Britain, but only on the express condition of Home Rule being definitely excluded from the programme of the Liberal Government.

The fact that subscriptions fall off unless Mr. Redmond and his followers can show something for their money, accounts for the continual "discontent and unrest."

The Irish Nationalist Party is only kept alive by agitation, and any movement towards making Ireland prosperous and contented is almost sure of Irish Nationalist hostility.

The attitude of the Irish Nationalist Party towards Sir Horace Plunkett's work of reviving Irish agriculture and industry, stamps them at once with the mask of the political agitator caring nothing for the prosperity of Ireland itself. The campaign against Sir Horace Plunkett has not ceased, although the Government have dismissed him at Mr. Redmond's bidding. Writing to Mr. Ford, the Editor of the *Irish World*, of New York, on October 4, 1904, Mr. Redmond disclosed his hand with perfect frankness. He wrote :—

> "The promotion of Irish industries is so praiseworthy an object that I am not surprised some of our people in America have been deceived in this matter. I myself, indeed, at one time entertained some belief in the good intentions of Sir Horace Plunkett and his friends, but recent events have entirely undeceived me, and Sir Horace Plunkett's recent book, full as it is of undisguised contempt for the Irish race, makes it plain to me that the real object of the movement in question is to undermine the National Party and divert the minds of our people from Home Rule, **which is the only thing which can ever lead to a real revival of Irish industries.**"*

"You must have Home Rule before a revival of Irish industries," says Mr. Redmond, an opinion which events have shown to be untrue, and, moreover, one which affords a true measure of his regard for Irish prosperity.†

If the present system of Government in Ireland were productive of universal discontent and unrest, it is clear that such feeling would disclose itself in a continuous and steady record of agitation. But with a Unionist Government in power the record of agitation and disorder declines to a low ebb, **because Unionists do not hesitate to enforce the law**, and Irish Nationalist agitators know they will be punished if crimes are committed.

On the other hand, a Radical Government gives its Irish Nationalist allies a free hand, and disorders and outrages multiply.

What more proof could be required of the truth of the statement that the "universal discontent and unrest" is due, not to the system of Government, but to unrestrained agitation by Irish Nationalist leaders.

An illustration of the truth of the argument is seen in the rise and development of cattle driving, and the prevalence of other forms of outrage and disorder under the Radical Government.

(6) Is incapable of satisfactorily promoting the material and intellectual progress of the people.

So far from that being the case, Ireland has made great progress during the last 23 years, as the following figures show :—

---

* Plunkett. "Ireland in the New Century." Second Edition, pp. 310, 311.

† See also *Freeman's Journal*, January 21, 1908: Letter from Mr. Redmond enclosing a copy of letter from Mr. T. W. Rolleston.

	1886.		to 1908.
Government Funds, &c., held in Ireland	£30,080,000	..	£39,498,000
Joint Stock Banks—			
Deposits and Cash Balances ..	£30,172,000	..	£52,068,000
Savings Banks—			
Post Office Balances	£2,703,000	..	£10,837,000
Trustee Balances	£2,007,000	..	£2,437,000
Emigration	63,135	..	23,952
Agricultural Progress —	1886.		1909.
Horses	549,204	..	599,293
Cattle	4,183,924	..	4,698,412
Sheep	3,366,043	..	4,132,392
Pigs	1,263,142	..	1,148,715
Poultry	13,909,822	..	24,101,883

The following figures are taken from the House of Commons Return, No. 119 of 1909. They show the number of depositors and the amount of the deposits in Post Office and Trustee Savings Banks in Ireland in each of the following years :—

	Depositors.		Amount.
1881	150,097	..	£3,802,101
1896	350,887	..	£8,334,993
1907	580,223	..	£13,089,158

INCREASE IN 25 YEARS :—
DEPOSITORS, 430,126.
AMOUNT, £9,287,057.

In the face of such figures is it not ridiculous to assert that Ireland has not made immense progress under the present system of Government.

It should be remembered that during this period there has been under the operation of the Fair Rents Courts a large decrease in rents. From figures in the return quoted above it appears that the rent reductions over the four provinces are as follows :—

	Percentage by which total rental has been reduced.		
	For a FIRST Statutory Term.	For a SECOND Statutory Term.	For the TWO Statutory Terms.
Ulster	19·8	22·5	37·5
Leinster ..	20·1	16·8	33·3
Connaught ..	21·0	17·5	34·1
Munster ..	22·2	18·3	36·3
IRELAND ..	20·7	19·6	35·9

In addition it should also be borne in mind that a sum of £2,000,000 a year is being distributed in the shape of Old Age Pensions throughout Ireland to the old people—a sum which if Ireland were self-governed she would have great difficulty in raising out of her own resources.

Mr. T. W. Russell, M.P., President of the Department of Agriculture, speaking at the Irish Club, London, on February 1, 1908, said :—

> "I see a peasantry who have borrowed £80,000,000 sterling since 1885 from the British Government. I see a peasantry repay that with a punctuality that extorts admiration, even from the maligners of Ireland. I see that peasantry secure in the possession of their land, devoting themselves to the improvement of their farms, and you can tell, going through Ireland to-day, the land that has passed into the hands of the people, and that which has not, and I see more than that—a feeling prevailing that never prevailed before." —*Freeman's Journal*, February 3, 1908.

As an acknowledgment of the vast improvement in the condition of Ireland, the following extract from Captain Condon's speech at Kilkenny, on October 3, 1909, is appended. He said :—

> "He was invited, as was his comrade, to look over Ireland and see for themselves what improvements had been effected, and he had seen many of them. He had seen the farmers lifted from the condition of slaves and serfs to be the owners of the proverty. He had seen the labourers put in possession of neat and comfortable cottages, which they had never enjoyed before. When men came back to them in the United States, after making a tour of Ireland, they said, 'How poor your people in the rural districts are!' Now they could ask them to look over the country and see the vast improvements that had been effected, when over 40,000 labourers' cottages, neat and satisfactory, had been built. He said that as a result of this work the population of Ireland had increased the last year, which it never did before for 50 years. He saw, too, thousands of instances where evicted tenants had been restored to their homes. There could be nothing more humiliating, nothing more depressing in the world, than the sight of the suffering of the man who had been evicted—his old father and mother, his wife, perhaps, who looked up to him with confidence and affection, his little children—all thrown out on the roadside to perish. He saw these men put back, and it was more than a satisfaction to himself to see one of these men put back. He was one of those who tried to have these men put back by other means, but that was not successful, and he knew the gentlemen who talked so much three thousand miles away about physical force were the men who prevented that being done. He had seen, too, a National University established."—*Freeman's Journal*, October 4, 1909.

Under the Union, Belfast, the capital of the North, the great Ulster City, has, for example, grown from a town of 25,000 inhabitants to a City of 350,000.

From its shipyards nearly 140,000 tons of new vessels were turned out last year,

From its port more than 2,500,000 tons of shipping are cleared every year.

It is the centre of the great linen industry, employing 120,000 hands.

It should also be noticed that the development of the country is due to British funds and British credit. Parliament has always been generous to Ireland. **Mr. Crilly, the Secretary of the United Irish League of Great Britain,** has put the matter as well as anybody, and the statement comes with great authority from one occupying so important a position in Irish Nationalist ranks.

Interviewed by a *Westminster Gazette* representative with reference to the merits of the Irish Parliamentary Party, Mr. Crilly said:—

> "The party during the period has succeeded in carrying reforms which have completely changed for the better the whole conditions of life in Ireland. Take the extension of local government to the counties, by which the detestable Grand Jury system was abolished; the various Land Acts; the latest Labourers Act, which makes provision for the building of 35,000 new cottages; the Town Tenants Act, protecting a large number of tenants from the rapacity of landlords; and the Evicted Tenants Act, which if not satisfactory, is at least something to go on with. . .
>
> "The Land Act of 1881 reduced rents by £2,059,000; the Arrears Acts, two years later, wiped completely out £2,000,000 of arrears. Under the Land Purchase Acts over £40,000,000 has been advanced for the purchase of Irish land, and the Act of 1903 provided for a further advance of £112,000,000. Then the Labourers Act involved the expenditure of £4,650,000 in the provision of cottages for labourers. Light railways, migration, and agricultural Acts have caused, in transferring tenants to richer lands and developing agriculture an outlay of £3,816,000. These make **the substantial total of £164,525,000 secured** by the Irish party and its policy **from 1879 to 1903, for the improvement of the social conditions of Ireland."** — *Westminster Gazette,* September 16, 1907.

In contrast to this, the words of Lord Clare, Lord High Chancellor at the time of the passing of the Act of Union will be of interest. **"We have not,"** he said, **"three years' redemption from bankruptcy or intolerable taxation, nor one hour's security against the renewal of exterminating civil war."**

By Mr. Birrell's Land Act this year British credit is to be pledged to the extent of a further £80,000,000, making £200,000,000 in all towards Irish Land Purchase.

Ireland, if self-governed would not be able to raise this amount upon advantageous terms, if at all.

Besides, British electors should be asked what guarantee there is that their loans would not be repudiated if the government of the country is placed in the hands of those who make no concealment of the enmity they bear against anything British?

(7) That the reform of the present system is a matter vital to the interests of Ireland.

No one will deny this: but opinions differ as to the manner in which Mr. Redmond's "reform" would be vital to the interests of Ireland

Unionists hold that Mr. Redmond's scheme of " reform " is a matter vital to the interests of Ireland in an entirely different way than Mr. Redmond does. Not only that, but Unionists also hold that the " reform " is vital to the interests of every part of the United Kingdom and the British Empire. Home Rule is not merely an Irish question. Lord Rosebery recognised this when he said in the House of Lords :—

> " The noble Marquess (Lord Salisbury) made one remark on the subject of Irish Home Rule with which I confess myself in entire accord. He said that before Irish Home Rule is conceded by the Imperial Parliament, England as the predominant member of the partnership of the three Kingdoms, will have to be convinced of its justice. That may seem to be a considerable admission to make, because your Lordships well know that the majority of English Members of Parliament, elected from England proper, are hostile to Home Rule."—Parl. Deb., March 12, 1894.

Home Rule would not be merely a new system of Government in Ireland. It would mean also fundamental changes in the constitution of the United Kingdom : it would be an alteration of the terms of partnership as set out between Great Britaln in the Act of Union, and such being the case the predominant partner must, as Lord Rosebery says, have the commanding voice.

(8) A matter calculated to promote the well-being of the people of Great Britain.

From this it is clear that Mr. Redmond recognises the force of the " predominant partner " argument, and he asserts, therefore, that his plan would be " calculated to promote the well-being of the people of Great Britain." This we take leave to doubt.

Has Mr. Redmond abandoned his former leader, Mr. Parnell ? Does he, or does he not, hold by the Cincinnati doctrine, quoted at the beginning of this memorandum ? If he does not hold to it, he must settle the matter with his followers. If he does hold to it, how can he truthfully declare Home Rule to be " calculated to promote the well-being of the people of Great Britain ? "

As a matter of fact, there is not the slightest doubt that Mr. Redmond does stand by Mr. Parnell. His speeches prove it. (See article " Mr. John Redmond, M.P., Home Rule and the Empire " pages 16-18 of this number.)

The examples of Irish Nationalist " regard " for our country are innumerable. But those given in pages 16-18 will be sufficient to show how ridiculous is Mr. Redmond's regard for the " well-being of the people of Great Britain."

It is only necessary to point out that the extracts are not the utterances of irresponsible Nationalist agitators, but are expressions of opinion by the present Irish Nationalist Leader, whose high and responsible position necessarily involves a careful weighing of words before they are uttered.

Proof of the disloyalty of the Irish Nationalist Party is not founded alone on speeches : by their actions they are notorious. Witness the cheering by the Nationalist M.P.'s when the news of British defeats in South Africa was received ; Witness the disloyal and seditious resolutions passed by Nationalist County Councils during the war ; witness the

Nationalist campaign against enlistment in the British Army; witness the degree day at the **Royal (?)** University, when the authorities were afraid to play the National Anthem!

All these speeches and facts being true and accurate, and Nationalists not daring to deny them, Mr. Redmond asks us to accept his assurance that Home Rule is "calculated greatly to promote the well-being of the people of Great Britain!"

Surely the question may well be asked:—"Why this sudden desire for Great Britain's welfare?"

(9) And the solution of this problem can only be attained by giving to the Irish people the legislative and executive control of all purely Irish affairs.

Mr. Redmond means by giving to the Irish Nationalists "the legislative and executive control of all purely Irish affairs." And they would not long be content with this, they would demand complete separation. (See pages 14, 16-18.) Home Rule means the surrender of the rights of the Imperial Parliament. Surely the desire of the Radicals to receive the support of the Irish Home Rulers in their campaign against the second Chamber is not a sufficient reason for breaking up the Constitution.

IRISH DIARY.

November 28.—Mr. J. Devlin, M.P., at Claremorris. Mr. L. Ginnell, M.P., at Rathowen.

December 3.—Annual meeting of the Liberal Unionist Council. Resolution passed against Home Rule.

December 9.—Mr. J. Devlin, M.P., at Newry. Mr. J. Dillon, M.P., at Dublin.

December 10.—Liberal demonstration at the Albert Hall:—Mr. Asquith on Self-Government for Ireland. Mr. J. Devlin, M.P., at Belfast.

December 12.—Mr. J. Dillon, M.P., at Dungarvan.

December 14.—Meeting of the National Directory at Dublin:—Approval of Radical Home Rule policy.

December 15.—Nationalist meeting at Dublin, speeches by Mr. J. Redmond, M.P., Mr. J. Dillon, M.P., and Mr. J. Devlin, M.P.

Vacher & Sons, Parliamentary Printers, Westminster, S.W.—24544.

UNION DEFENCE LEAGUE.

PUBLICATIONS.

"IRISH FACTS FOR BRITISH PLATFORMS," Monthly, 3d.

Annual Subscription, 3s., including Postage.

LEAFLETS.

1 Page: **3d.** *per 100;* **1s. 6d.** *per 1,000.*

2 Pages: **6d.** *per 100;* **3s.** *per 1,000.*

4 Pages: **1s.** *per 100;* **5s.** *per 1,000.*

No. 1. Mr. John Redmond, M.P., on Home Rule and the Empire. 4 pages.

2. Working Men should oppose Home Rule. 2 pages.

6. Ireland under Two Governments. 1 page.

9. The Irish Unionists' Appeal to British Electors. 2 pages.

10. Home Rule an Issue at the General Election. 2 pages.

15. Does Ireland want Home Rule? 2 pages.

16. A Terrible Radical Record. 2 pages.

17. Home Rule means our Enemies' Triumph. 2 pages.

18. A Prosperous Ireland. 2 pages.

LOYALIST MAP OF IRELAND. In Four Colours. 4to.

4s. per 100; **20s.** per 1,000.

ALL ORDERS TO BE ADDRESSED TO—

The Secretary,

UNION DEFENCE LEAGUE,

25, Victoria Street,

Westminster, S.W.